

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-52 are pending. Claims 1-52 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 19, 31, 38, 39, 43, 45-48, and 50 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,821 of Ballantyne et al. (“Ballantyne”).

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

A method comprising:

representing a first collection of media objects on a first sheet having a first graphical content representing the media objects, wherein the first sheet is a cover sheet that provides access to the first collection of the media objects;

creating a second collection of media objects from the first collection of media objects; and

re-marking the first sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the first sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the second collection of the media objects.

(emphasis added)

As set forth above, amended claim 1 requires re-marking the first sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the first sheet in a non-

electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the second collection of the media objects.

Ballantyne discloses electronically accessing and distributing information. More specifically, Ballantyne discloses entering the new information through the PDA technology by simply writing as normal on the pen display tablet (col. 14, lines 23-25).

Thus, Ballantyne merely discloses writing on the display tablet. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to re-marking the sheet that includes writing a graphical content representing the collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the collection of the media objects. Ballantyne fails to disclose the sheet including a graphical content in the non-electronic form that provides access to the collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Because Ballantyne fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Given that claims 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50, and 52 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50, and 52 are not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. US2002/0052888 of Sellen et al. (“Sellen”).

Amended claim 46 requires performing an erasing operation on the scanned portion of the document that includes a content in a non-electronic form at the location of the portion to erase the content in the non-electronic form.

Sellen discloses comparing the paper version of the document and the stored version and producing a revised document incorporating any changes made to the stored version and any annotations made to the paper version (paragraph [0036]).

Thus, Sellen merely discloses producing a new, revised version of the document based on the paper version and the stored version. In contrast, amended claim 46 refers to an erasing operation on the scanned portion of the document that includes a content in a non-electronic form at the location of the portion. Sellen does not disclose erasing operation on the paper version of the document, as recited in amended claim 46.

Because Sellen fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 46, applicants respectfully submit that claim 46, as amended, is not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. US2002/0064113 of Geeslin et al. (“Geeslin”).

Amended claim 47 reads as follows:

detecting a writable mark when scanning a re-writable paper, wherein the writable mark includes a shape placed on the re-writable paper in a non-electronic form; preventing modification to the re-writable paper that includes preventing from printing on the re-writable paper in response to detecting the writable mark.

(emphasis added)

Geeslin, in contrast, discloses a protection state byte (Figure 1D) on an optical disc media. In contrast, amended claim 47 refers to a shape placed on the re-writable paper in a non-electronic form. The protection state byte of Geeslin is not a shape placed on the re-writable paper in a non-electronic form, as recited in amended claim 47.

Accordingly, Geeslin fails to disclose detecting a writable mark when scanning a re-writable paper, wherein the writable mark includes a shape placed on the re-writable paper in a non-electronic form, as recited in amended claim 47.

Additionally, Geeslin fails to disclose preventing modification to the re-writable paper that includes preventing from printing on the re-writable paper in response to detecting the writable mark, as recited in amended claim 47.

Because Geeslin fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 47, applicants respectfully submit that claim 47, as amended, is not anticipated by Geeslin under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,598 of Kashiwagi et al. (“Kashiwagi ”).

As set forth above, Ballantyne fails to disclose re-marking the sheet that includes writing a graphical content representing the collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Kashiwagi, in contrast, discloses electronically acquiring an electronic memo to a document (Abstract), and also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest re-marking the sheet that includes writing a graphical content representing the collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Ballantyne, nor Kashiwagi discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Ballantyne does not teach or suggest a combination with Kashiwagi, and Kashiwagi does not teach or suggest a combination with Ballantyne. Ballantyne teaches distributing personal health care information. Kashiwagi, in contrast, teaches adding a memo to the document. One of skill in the art would not look at distributing the personal health care information, as taught by Ballantyne, to add the memo to the document, as taught by Kashiwagi.

Furthermore, even if adding of the memo to the document of Kashiwagi were incorporated into the health care information distribution system of Ballantyne, such a combination would still lack re-marking the sheet that includes writing a graphical content representing the collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Kashiwagi.

Claims 11, 26, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,713,148 of Cardullo et al. (“Cardullo”).

Cardullo, in contrast, discloses a transponder apparatus, and similar to Ballantyne, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Cardullo, nor Ballantyne discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if the transponder of Cardullo were incorporated into the health care information distribution system of Ballantyne, such a combination would still lack re-marking the sheet that includes writing a graphical content representing the collection of media objects onto the first sheet, such that the second graphical content is presented on the sheet in a non-electronic form, wherein the re-marked first sheet including the second graphical content in the non-electronic form provides access to the collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 11, 26, and 35 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 26, and 35 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Cardullo.

Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,063 of Ludtke et al. (“Ludtke”).

Ludtke, in contrast, discloses an apparatus for representing devices, and similar to Ballantyne, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Ludtke, nor Ballantyne discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

Given that claims 16-18 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-18 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Ludtke.

Claim 51 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne, in view of U.S. Publication No. US2002/0052888 of Sellen et al. (“Sellen”).

For at list the same reasons as discussed with respect to amended claims 1 and 46, even if Ballantyne and Sellen were combined such a combination would still lack erasing a portion of a sheet having a non-electronic representation of a collection of media objects, wherein the representation includes a first graphical content to represent the media objects in a non-electronic form, wherein the sheet is a cover sheet including the first graphical content in the non-electronic form that provides access to the collection of the media objects; and marking the portion of the sheet with updated information that includes writing a second graphical content onto the sheet in a non-electronic form, as recited in amended claim 50.

Given that claim 51 depends from amended claim 50, and adds additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claim 51 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Sellen.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11/25/2008

By: /Tatiana Rossin/
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300

Customer No. 008791